



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/820,581	04/07/2004	Mark E. Deem	37531-501C02 (17315-00200)	8576
78169 7590 05/29/2009 MINTZ, LEVIN, COHN, FERRIS, GLOVSKY AND POPEO, PC ATTN: PATENT INTAKE CUSTOMER NO. [EVALVE] ONE FINANCIAL CENTER BOSTON, MA 02111			EXAMINER BACHMAN, LINDSEY MICHELE	
			ART UNIT 3734	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 05/29/2009	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/820,581	Applicant(s) DEEM ET AL.	
	Examiner LINDSEY BACHMAN	Art Unit 3734	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Lindsey Bachman. (3) Fred Hernandez.

(2) Todd Manahan. (4) Natalie Schiller.

Date of Interview: 20 May 2009.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 11, 21 and 27.

Identification of prior art discussed: Noera, Maisano.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed proposed claim amendments with respect to the art of record. In light of Applicant's explanation of what was meant by "the same catheter", Examiner agrees that In re Pfieffer was not properly applied. Examiner suggested adding limitations to the claim that more clearly state that "the same catheter" is actually one catheter containing more than one tool on the distal end for performing heart valve repair functions.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Lindsey Bachman/ Examiner, Art Unit 3734	/Todd E Manahan/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3734
--	--